

From:
To:
Date:
Subject:

JOchmann@aol.com
ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 EST
General Class?

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Received: from imo-r03.mx.aol.com (imo-r03.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.99])
by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with ESMTP id gBUNxTs18988
for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:30 -0500 (EST)

Received: from JOchmann@aol.com
by imo-r03.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v34.13.) id i.11.5eb4f34 (16633)
for <ak437@mail.acorn.net>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 -0500 (EST)

From: JÖchmann@aol.com

Message-ID: <11.5eb4f34.2b4237de@aol.com>

Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 EST

Subject: General Class?

To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1 11.5eb4f34.2b4237de boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 8.0 for Windows US sub 230

X-UIDL: =55e9@A0e95\7!!@> d9

Status: RO

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

```
--part1_11.5eb4f34.2b4237de_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
```

Dale,

If your recommendation were to pass, would it include Generals as well?

John.....a.k.a. WA8NDL

```
--part1_11.5eb4f34.2b4237de_boundary
Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
```

```
<HTML><FONT FACE=arial,helvetica><BODY BGCOLOR="#ffffff"><FONT style="BACKGROUND-COLOR: #ffffff" SIZE=2
<BR>
```

If your recommendation were to pass, would it include Generals as well?

[illegible]

```
--part1 11.5eb4f34.2b4237de boundary--
```

End
Smile



Rm

10620

Message 12 of 20

From: wa4ixn@juno.com
 To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
 Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600
 Subject: Upgrades

Received: from m5.nyc.untld.com (m5.nyc.untld.com [64.136.22.68])
 by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gVBVAts04691
 for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 06:10:55 -0500 (EST)
 Received: from cookie.juno.com by cookie.juno.com for <"uiPPpOjxs1EiqWFBG6HhPQ1OQRPhQihjKyMIy44JCDUFnvRe
 Received: (from wa4ixn@juno.com)
 by m5.nyc.untld.com (jqueueemail) id HMCTMEAY; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 06:10:27 EST
 To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
 Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600
 Subject: Upgrades
 Message-ID: <20021231.051319.-836001.36.wa4ixn@juno.com>
 X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.33
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
 X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-2,43,62,70,88,95,103-108
 From: wa4ixn@juno.com
 X-UIDL: &Gpd9+<0e9\$;@!!?+Ee9
 Status: RO.

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Received: from m5.nyc.untld.com
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi Dale,

Your proposal is good. Most hams don't realize that the exams have become easier through the years. The purpose being to swell the ranks with new hams without making it too difficult for them. In the "good-old-days" the exams were more technically oriented to the kind of equipment one would expect to be operating. A lot of which would be built from scratch or converted from military equipment. Rules and regulations weren't such a large portion of the exams. Neither was a lot of algebraic calculation that had little or no use in the 'real world' of ham radio. It seems now that the 'wizards' who sit and dream up the question pools are looking for electronic engineer types instead of ordinary people who just want to enjoy the hobby and talk to others of the same ilk down the street or around the world. I've been saying -- too loudly sometimes -- that if you want to play the moon bounce, ham TV, microwave, satellite games, etc., then fine. Study up on the required technology and go for it. But don't take chunks of the ordinary bands away from those of us who studied hard for the exams of 30, 40, 50 years ago, with the bent toward punched steel, hand wired, tube filled chassis, and earned the privilege and used the whole band to good purpose, just to glorify your urge to expand your knowledge. I don't know if you were around back in the 1960's when, with the full support of the ARRL, the 'blue-bloods' of ham radio crammed their desire for "incentive licensing" down the throat of the FCC and took big chunks of the bands away from the majority of hams who were, for the most part, much more active in actually using those frequencies than they were. It took a lot of hard-nosed politicking and a lot of money in the right places, but they got it done over the cries of despair from the 'average' hams and even from such notables as Barry Goldwater who was very active in the efforts to stop the breaking up of the bands. A good 'for instance' would be: You've been a licensed driver for 20 or 30 years and have exercised the privileges of your license by driving any road you want, from one end to the other, including the superhighways and interstates, in your good old Ford or Chevy. Suddenly, a bunch of wealthy executives of the black tie and tails group with their Mercedes and Jaguars decide to change things more in their favor. If you can't, or don't want to, come up to their standard, then they are going to pressure the highway department into kicking you off the roads you have driven ever since you got your license. From now on you can only drive on the back roads and be crowded into grid block traffic while the high-and-mighty who meet the new standard they set for themselves get the full use of all the roads, including the almost vacant portions they've set aside for their



exclusive use.

I studied hard. I build radios from scratch and scrap. I learned all I could about communications. I took and passed on the first go-around both the Novice and the General exams. Since then, over the past fifty (50) years, I've probably built more radio equipment from junk-box parts and from kits than any dozen of those so-called "super ham" Advanced and Extra class types. About the only things Heathkit made between 1955 (when I first could afford to buy them) and when they closed their doors in the mid '70s that I didn't build right out of the box was their television sets and stereo music boxes. The same for Knight kits and several Eico transceivers. Even now, at age 66, I still get the honor of handling the high-speed Morse on field day. Out of 69 club members there are only 3 of us who can handle more than 10 wpm. And I still use, almost exclusively, Morse in my daily operation. I don't use a keyer or a keyboard. I still use a 20-year-old Vibroplex (have worn out 3 of them), or when mobile an old WW-II leg-clamp J-38. I normally cruise along at 35-40 wpm, except with the J-38, and slow down only to work and help a Novice or Tech-plus learn code. I do have a microphone (D-104) on my desk, but it has a plastic cover on it and hasn't been used more than once in the last couple of years.

Yes, I am considering moving up to Extra Class, I've looked at the books and the question pool. To tell the truth, I have no use at all for satellites, TV, microwave, etc., and I find the high mathematics required just to regain the lost spectrum that I worked hard for 50 years ago, and feel I didn't deserve to have taken away from me, to be just so much useless garbage. I may be forced to learn all that algebraic gibberish to get my frequencies back, but I'll never use it and will toss the books in the trash the moment the exam is passed.

That brings me to the point of this letter. Why did you only specify advancing Novice and Advanced Class licensees?? There are thousands of General Class bums like me out here who are still burning at the stake over having our hard earned frequencies yanked away from us 35 years ago for the sake of a handful of nerds who only wanted the apportionment for their private use and who spend most of their time playing in the GHz bands anyway. We would love to be able to work the low ends and middle of the 80, 40, 20, and 15 meter bands again. To be able to spread out a bit so it would be so crowded all the time with everybody jammed in to small segments of the bands. Why not allow for General Class hams with 20 or more years of experience and clean records to get 'merit advancement' up to Extra Class too. I think that my 50 + years as a General (the highest class there was when I took the exam) and being highly active, especially in ARES, RACES, and Skywarn, with no violations or warnings and not even a OO note on my record, should count for something worthwhile rather than a 'look-down-the-nose from the hoity-toities of the modern super-hams, many of whom act as if they are the only ones deserving any operating privileges at all.

I think I'll get down off my soapbox now. This subject is one that I have been extremely angry and outspoken on for many years, and likely will continue to be so. I apologize if you feel I've overstepped the bounds of propriety here, but I'm not one to beat around the bush when it comes to something I think is important and will help improve the operating quality and morale of the majority of affected Amateur Radio operators.

Believe me. I have no quarrel with you as an Extra Class. I know you worked hard for it and deserve all the extra privileges it provides. I just think there are many of us out here who deserve more than the short shrift we got at the hands of a few holier-than-thou's who took command of the bands 35 years ago, with the able assistance of the ARRL pushing the buttons at the FCC. There's just not too many of us left now who have the strength left to fight anymore. When the last of us is SK it will all be over.

73 & Happy New Year

O. B. Wolf - WA4IXN

ex: 5A1TS, TA4RZ, DL4NH

WA4IXN/XV Air Mobile

WA4IXN/HZ Air Mobile





Message 11 of 21

From: "Bob Maser" <bmaser@tampabay.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 22:49:25 -0500
Subject: RM-10621

Dale, I disagree with your proposal RM-10621 just as much as I disagreed with the no code Extra. And I still think that it was a slap in the face for those of us that had to get to that 20 WPM level in order to be able to use DX frequencies. This latest proposal of yours makes no sense at all. The way I look at it, if you fail the driving test for 20 years you still shouldn't be given a license to drive until you learn well enough to pass the test. Anyone who has been an Advanced for 20 years either doesn't have the interest in putting in the effort or has probably been inactive for most of that time. We all seem to be so concerned that this great hobby of ours is getting obsolete that we are willing to drop the price of admission so that anyone can get on the air. If you would take the time to listen around the bands, you can hear testimony that the hobby is becoming almost as bad as CB.

Sincerely,
Bob Maser
W6TR

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopædia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude



Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary



Message 15 of 21

From: W2RRT@aol.com
To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 19:41:48 EST
Subject: (no subject)

Hi Dale,

I have just read your petition RM-10620 and I think it's great on your request and feelings on that particular subject. I don't know what the FCC feelings is going to be.

But what ever it is I thank you for trying. I have been a "HAM" for 56 years and cannot believe they (FCC) would do such a change with NO REWARDS for the extra license. All they did was degrade the licensing system by demoting the class "A" status to a lower level with NO explanation. I WILL NEVER TAKE THE EXTRA CLASS TEST. Those are my personal feelings. In any event, thaks again for your interest and petition.

sincerly and best 73's

Nick Harris W2RRT
W2RRT@aol.com



RECEIVED

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopædia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude

JAN 30 2003



Electronic Mailbox
Office of Secretary



Message 14 of 21

From: "AL MAC KENZIE" <WB6BBH@arrrl.net>
To: <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 14:39:47 -0800
Subject: RM-10620

Received: from mail.netzon.net (netzon-gw.netzon.net [65.200.2.65])
by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gBVMdgs11540
for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 17:39:43 -0500 (EST)
Received: (qmail 23075 invoked from network); 31 Dec 2002 22:39:35 -0000
Received: from 208-187-134-131.lax.ca.ppp-inter.net (HELO np0gadckaosc1n) (208.187.134.131)
by hb1.netzon.net with SMTP; 31 Dec 2002 22:39:35 -0000
Message-ID: <000801c2b11d\$876c60f0\$8386bbd0@np0gadckaosc1n>
From: "AL MAC KENZIE" <WB6BBH@arrrl.net>
To: <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>
Subject: RM-10620
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 14:39:47 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0005_01C2B0DA.77B73650"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2720.3000
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
X-UIDL: -Lc!!BIN!!U7j!!Aj~!!
Status: RO

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0005_01C2B0DA.77B73650
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

KUDOS TO YOU DALE TO GET AN RM FROM THE FCC I HAVE TRIED TO MAKE =
COMMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL BUT IT WONT WORK FOR ME. ONCE AGAIN =
THE FCC MAKES THIER E MAIL FORM TO COMPLICATED. I SUPPLIED ALL THEY =
WANTED & GET THE ANSWER THAT MY NAME ADDRESS & ZIP CODE ARE IN ERROR. I =
CERTAINLY DID TRY. I HAVE READ THE ARRL BULLETIN ON SEVERAL HF NETS & DO =
HOPE THOSE THAT MAKE THIER COMMENTS ARE SUCCESFULL.

HAPPY NEW YEAR

73 88
AL ALICE
ARRL BULLETIN MANAGER-ORANGE SECTION
www.qsl.net/arrrl-orange/
www.3952khz.net
WB6BBH@arrrl.net

-----_NextPart_000_0005_01C2B0DA.77B73650
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2722.900" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV>KUDOS TO YOU DALE TO GET AN RM FROM THE =
FCC I HAVE=20
TRIED TO MAKE COMMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL BUT IT WONT WORK FOR ME. =

RECEIVED

JAN 3 0 2003

From: AL MAC KENZIE
On: 31 Dec 2002





RM-10620

From: J. T. BURIK
To: ak437@acorn.net
Date: Tue, Jan 14, 2003 4:15 PM
Subject: Re: RM-10620 Your Help Is Need & thanks for your support

After fighting with the FCC to grandfather general and advanced class operators after the incentive licensing program of 1968 and forever not being heard or listened to, I am appalled at the request of RM 10620. If the FCC grandfathers novices again and then novices now along with advanced operators after grand fathering technicians while forgetting generals from 1968 who earned full privileges and had them taken away.....shame on the FCC. I fought for 35 years to get back what I earned to NO AVAIL, only smart assed remarks from FCC people who really did not understand what they had done to me and others back in 1968. JT Burik K3QC

On Tue, 14 Jan 2003 10:21:49 US/Eastern ak437@acorn.net writes:

- > Please include your views, a number of filling make you point about
- > the Generals, Perhaps they will also resolve this at the same
- > time. It is a very good point. [Please Help Below if you wish]
- > *****
- > Have you been able to get into the ECFS system to file any
- > comments or 'Add'l' Comments.
- >
- > For Direct input to the Chairman & Commissioners
- > on any view for or against the RM-10620 suggested rule making.
- >
- > Input on any class who may have been left out on the "RM" that you
- > think was left out.
- >
- > Please have your frined's file ECFS comments - Send E-mail's -
- > Write letters if need be. In general Sevreral people have
- > filed comments about this "RM" by entering the wrong "RM" number
- > and mixing it up with the AMSTAT RM before the commission. The
- > ARRL sent out a correction on the errors they posted on Dec 24,
- > but it was not a wide circulation. They did make a correction &
- > thanks to the ARRL some people have made add'l remarks to clear
- > or enter there add'l thoughts also. You Input is need if you
- > feel someone was left out.
- >
- > mpowell@fcc.gov FCC Chairman [Son of Retired 5 star General of
- > Army}}
- > [Also Son of current U. S. Sec of
- > State]
- >
- > kabernat@fcc.gov
- >
- > mcopps@fcc.gov
- >
- > kjmweb@fcc.gov
- >
- > jadelste@fcc.gov
- >

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

WZL
Commission

> Any direct E-may may help, If you are having trouble getting into
> the
> ECFS system to file comments.
>
> Any E-mails from your frinds to the above with copy also to via
> regular U.S. Mail to the:
>
> Federal Communications Commission
> Attn: Sec of Commeission
> 445 - - 12th Street - - S.W.
> Washington, D. C. 20554
>
> Please List the RM-10620 number on corraspondance.
>
> Thanks
>
> Dale E. Reich
>
> *****
>
>
> -----
> This message was sent using ACORN.net, a service of the
> Akron-Summit County Public Library. <http://www.acorn.net>
>
>
>
>

CC: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein

JOchmann@aol.com
ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 EST
General Class?

[illegible]



Message 8 of 39

From: "CWO3" <cwo3@elp.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 16:53:08 -0700
Subject: RM10620

RECEIVED

JAN 3 0 2003

Received: from txsmtp03.texas.rr.com (smtp3.texas.rr.com [24.93.36.231])
by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with ESMTP id gBUNr9s18440
for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:53:10 -0500 (EST)
Received: from k6cwo (cpe-24-174-215-49.elp.rr.com [24.174.215.49])
by txsmtp03.texas.rr.com (8.12.5/8.12.2) with SMTP id gBUNngUr015565
for <ak437@mail.acorn.net>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:49:54 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <00a901c2b05e\$9a914020\$1400a8c0@k6cwo>
From: "CWO3" <cwo3@elp.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Subject: RM10620
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 16:53:08 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
X-UIDL: QHud99?f!!^nd!!c_!!!
Status: RO

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Dale, I would prefer to address my comments about RM-10620 using a =
more direct avenue, at least get you comment first.

I think that your suggestion the establish a rule change that would =
advance by one level "Novice" and "Advance" ham radio license holders, =
that have held there license for more than twenty years, is admirable, =
and at first brush a really great suggestion that would encourage and =
recognize deserving individuals.



I haven't been a ham that long, first licensed in April 2000. My =
experience since then is that the longer many, not all, ham radio =
operators are licensed the less they honor the spirit of ham radio, and =
conduct themselves as "elitist". The biggest violation being the use of =
the phonetic alphabet. Even when requested many senior hams simply =
repeat what ever it is they have become accustom to, or make some =
unnecessary comment. The "elitist" attitude does not end there, but =
that is the most common infraction, or lack of courtesy even when asked =
for.

I agree that with time all active hams learn more about the hobby than =
can be found in any book, although I must admit that the available =
documentation on a whole range of ham related topics is excellent. As =
it relates to the "Novice" class license's...somewhere along the line =
they should have learn just enough to take the test for the next level. =
As it applies to the "Advance" class license's I can see that having to =
recall the amount of technical knowledge required to achieve "Extra" =
class may be a tall order, and if they are in good standing in the ham =
community, then I agree with your recommendation, with my above comment. =

I am confident that you, as are all active ham radio operators. are =
familiar with the points I have commented on. I would enjoy a dialogue =
with you, so as to listen to your perspective before making a public =
comment with the FCC.

Sincerely,
 Roland
 K6CWO

-----=_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140

Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="Windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Dwindows-1252">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1126" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#d4d0c8>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>Hi Dale,&nbsp; I would prefer to =
address&nbsp;my=20
comments about RM-10620 using a more direct avenue, at least get you =
comment=20
first.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I think that your suggestion the establish a =
rule change=20
that would advance by one level "Novice" and "Advance" ham&nbsp;radio =
license=20
holders, that have held there license for more than twenty years, is =
admirable,=20
and at first&nbsp;brush a really great&nbsp;suggestion that would =
encourage and=20
recognize&nbsp;deserving individuals.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I haven't been a ham that long, first licensed =
in April=20
2000.&nbsp; My experience since then is that the longer many, not =
all,&nbsp;ham=20
radio operators are licensed the less they honor the spirit of ham =
radio, and=20
conduct themselves as "elitist".&nbsp; The biggest violation being the =
use of=20
the phonetic alphabet.&nbsp; Even when requested many senior hams simply =
repeat=20
what ever it is they have become accustom to, or make some unnecessary=20
comment.&nbsp; The "elitist" attitude does not end there, but that is =
the most=20
common infraction, or lack of courtesy even when asked for.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I agree that with time all active hams learn =
more about=20
the hobby than can be found in any book, although I must admit that the=20
available documentation on a whole range of ham related topics is=20
excellent.&nbsp; As it relates to the "Novice" class =
license's...somewhere along=20
the line they should have learn just enough to take the test for the =
next=20
level.&nbsp; As it applies to the "Advance" class license's I can see =
that=20
having to recall the amount of technical knowledge required to achieve =
"Extra"=20
class may be a tall order, and if they are in good standing in the ham=20
community, then I agree with your recommendation, with my above=20
comment.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I am confident that you, as are all active ham =
radio=20
operators. are familiar with the points I have commented on.&nbsp; I =
would enjoy=20
a dialogue with you, so as to listen to your perspective before making a =
public=20
comment with the FCC.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>Sincerely,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>Roland</FONT></DIV>
```

<DIV>K6CWO</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140--

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopædia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude





Message 5 of 22

From: "John E. Feltz" <jfw9jn@tznnet.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Date: Sat, 28 Dec 2002 08:11:37 -0600
Subject: rm10620

RECEIVED

JAN 5 0 2003

RECEIVED
JAN 5 0 2003

Hi dale

I concur with your petition in its entirety. Please may I have the FCC address or web site so I can also add my two cents in this endeavor. I will ask other hams in the area to also see this proposal. Thanks.

73, John W9JN

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopaedia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude





Message 19 of 22

From: ak437@acorn.net
To: k5zol@earthlink.net
CC: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Thu, 2 Jan 2003 15:39:17 US/Eastern
Subject: Re: UR FCC petition

RECEIVED
JAN 5 U 2003
Akron-Summit County Public Library

Thanks

Please have your comments filed on line at the FCC ECFS page.

Any additional input would be help!

If you have any other changes you feel should be blended into this please make your point line by line so they have public input.

Thanks Again

Dale Reich - k8ad

> I think your upgrade petition makes a lot of sense. goodluck.
> 73,
>
> Bob K5ZOL
>

This message was sent using ACORN.net, a service of the
Akron-Summit County Public Library. <http://www.acorn.net>

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopædia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude





RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Message 11 of 20

From: "Bob Maser" <bmaser@tampabay.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 22:49:25 -0500
Subject: RM-10621

Dale, I disagree with your proposal RM-10621 just as much as I disagreed with the no code Extra. And I still think that it was a slap in the face for those of us that had to get to that 20 WPM level in order to be able to use DX frequencies. This latest proposal of yours makes no sense at all. The way I look at it, if you fail the driving test for 20 years you still shouldn't be given a license to drive until you learn well enough to pass the test. Anyone who has been an Advanced for 20 years either doesn't have the interest in putting in the effort or has probably been inactive for most of that time. We all seem to be so concerned that this great hobby of ours is getting obsolete that we are willing to drop the price of admission so that anyone can get on the air. If you would take the time to listen around the bands, you can hear testimony that the hobby is becoming almost as bad as CB.

Sincerely,
Bob Maser
W6TR

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopaedia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude





Message 12 of 20

From: wa4ixn@juno.com
To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600
Subject: Upgrades

RECEIVED

JAN 5 0 2003

Hi Dale,

Your proposal is good. Most hams don't realize that the exams have become easier through the years. The purpose being to swell the ranks with new hams without making it too difficult for them. In the "good-old-days" the exams were more technically oriented to the kind of equipment one would expect to be operating. A lot of which would be built from scratch or converted from military equipment. Rules and regulations weren't such a large portion of the exams. Neither was a lot of algebraic calculation that had little or no use in the 'real world' of ham radio. It seems now that the 'wizards' who sit and dream up the question pools are looking for electronic engineer types instead of ordinary people who just want to enjoy the hobby and talk to others of the same ilk down the street or around the world. I've been saying -- too loudly sometimes -- that if you want to play the moon bounce, ham TV, microwave, satellite games, etc., then fine. Study up on the required technology and go for it. But don't take chunks of the ordinary bands away from those of us who studied hard for the exams of 30, 40, 50 years ago, with the bent toward punched steel, hand wired, tube filled chassis, and earned the privilege and used the whole band to good purpose, just to glorify your urge to expand your knowledge. I don't know if you were around back in the 1960's when, with the full support of the ARRL, the 'blue-bloods' of ham radio crammed their desire for "incentive licensing" down the throat of the FCC and took big chunks of the bands away from the majority of hams who were, for the most part, much more active in actually using those frequencies than they were. It took a lot of hard-nosed politicking and a lot of money in the right places, but they got it done over the cries of despair from the 'average' hams and even from such notables as Barry Goldwater who was very active in the efforts to stop the breaking up of the bands. A good 'for instance' would be: You've been a licensed driver for 20 or 30 years and have exercised the privileges of your license by driving any road you want, from one end to the other, including the superhighways and interstates, in your good old Ford or Chevy. Suddenly, a bunch of wealthy executives of the black tie and tails group with their Mercedes and Jaguars decide to change things more in their favor. If you can't, or don't want to, come up to their standard, then they are going to pressure the highway department into kicking you off the roads you have driven ever since you got your license. From now on you can only drive on the back roads and be crowded into grid block traffic while the high-and-mighty who meet the new standard they set for themselves get the full use of all the roads, including the almost vacant portions they've set aside for their exclusive use.

I studied hard. I build radios from scratch and scrap. I learned all I could about communications. I took and passed on the first go-around both the Novice and the General exams. Since then, over the past fifty (50) years, I've probably built more radio equipment from junk-box parts and from kits than any dozen of those so-called "super ham" Advanced and

Extra class types. About the only things Heathkit made between 1955 (when I first could afford to buy them) and when they closed their doors in the mid '70s that I didn't build right out of the box was their television sets and stereo music boxes. The same for Knight kits and several Eico transceivers. Even now, at age 66, I still get the honor of handling the high-speed Morse on field day. Out of 69 club members there are only 3 of us who can handle more than 10 wpm. And I still use, almost exclusively, Morse in my daily operation. I don't use a keyer or a keyboard. I still use a 20-year-old Vibroplex (have worn out 3 of them), or when mobile an old WW-II leg-clamp J-38. I normally cruise along at 35-40 wpm, except with the J-38, and slow down only to work and help a Novice or Tech-plus learn code. I do have a microphone (D-104) on my desk, but it has a plastic cover on it and hasn't been used more than once in the last couple of years.

Yes, I am considering moving up to Extra Class, I've looked at the books and the question pool. To tell the truth, I have no use at all for satellites, TV, microwave, etc., and I find the high mathematics required just to regain the lost spectrum that I worked hard for 50 years ago, and feel I didn't deserve to have taken away from me, to be just so much useless garbage. I may be forced to learn all that algebraic gibberish to get my frequencies back, but I'll never use it and will toss the books in the trash the moment the exam is passed.

That brings me to the point of this letter. Why did you only specify advancing Novice and Advanced Class licensees?? There are thousands of General Class bums like me out here who are still burning at the stake over having our hard earned frequencies yanked away from us 35 years ago for the sake of a handful of nerds who only wanted the apportionment for their private use and who spend most of their time playing in the GHz bands anyway. We would love to be able to work the low ends and middle of the 80, 40, 20, and 15 meter bands again. To be able to spread out a bit so it would be so crowded all the time with everybody jammed in to small segments of the bands. Why not allow for General Class hams with 20 or more years of experience and clean records to get 'merit advancement' up to Extra Class too. I think that my 50 + years as a General (the highest class there was when I took the exam) and being highly active, especially in ARES, RACES, and Skywarn, with no violations or warnings and not even a OO note on my record, should count for something worthwhile rather than a 'look-down-the-nose from the hoity-toities of the modern super-hams, many of whom act as if they are the only ones deserving any operating privileges at all.

I think I'll get down off my soapbox now. This subject is one that I have been extremely angry and outspoken on for many years, and likely will continue to be so. I apologize if you feel I've overstepped the bounds of propriety here, but I'm not one to beat around the bush when it comes to something I think is important and will help improve the operating quality and morale of the majority of affected Amateur Radio operators.

Believe me. I have no quarrel with you as an Extra Class. I know you worked hard for it and deserve all the extra privileges it provides. I just think there are many of us out here who deserve more than the short shrift we got at the hands of a few holier-than-thou's who took command of the bands 35 years ago, with the able assistance of the ARRL pushing the buttons at the FCC. There's just not too many of us left now who have the strength left to fight anymore. When the last of us is SK it will all be over.

73 & Happy New Year
O. B. Wolf - WA4IXN
ex: 5A1TS, TA4RZ, DL4NH

WA4IXN/XV Air Mobile
WA4IXN/HZ Air Mobile

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopaedia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude





RECEIVED

Message 14 of 22

From: "AL MAC KENZIE" <WB6BBH@arrl.net>
To: <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 14:39:47 -0800
Subject: RM-10620

JAN 5 0 2003

KUDOS TO YOU DALE TO GET AN RM FROM THE FCC I HAVE TRIED TO MAKE COMMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL BUT IT WONT WORK FOR ME. ONCE AGAIN THE FCC MAKES THIER E MAIL FORM TO COMPLICATED. I SUPPLIED ALL THEY WANTED & GET THE ANSWER THAT MY NAME ADDRESS & ZIP CODE ARE IN ERROR. I CERTAINLY DID TRY. I HAVE READ THE ARRL BULLETIN ON SEVERAL HF NETS & DO HOPE THOSE THAT MAKE THIER COMMENTS ARE SUCCESFULL.

HAPPY NEW YEAR

73 88
AL ALICE

ARRL BULLETIN MANAGER-ORANGE SECTION

www.qsl.net/arrl-orange/www.3952khz.netWB6BBH@arrl.net

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 [Endymion Corporation](#)
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 [Endymion Corporation](#) and [Hypnopædia Studios](#).
Microcompanies With Attitude



RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Comments regarding RM-10620

While this proposal represents a natural extension of the restructuring efforts of April 15, 2000, it seems to me to be overly complicated and burdensome.

I recommend that this proposal be modified to simply automatically upgrade ALL Novices to Technician with HF privileges to upgrade ALL Advanced class licensees to Extra class at the next license renewal. My suggestion is based on the following:

- 1) When compared to those who earned their Technician and Extra class licenses after April 15, 2000, there is no doubt in my mind that Novice and Advanced class licensees put forth greater effort to obtain their license. Further, these licensees would have at least 10 years experience, which is a much better teacher than studying a license manual. My recommendation would simply grant a full license, without involving special endorsements or conditions.
- 2) The upgrade process would be handled by the FCC as part of the routine license renewal process. No significant burden would be placed on the FCC, and no additional burden would be placed on the Volunteer Examiner community. No expense would be incurred by the licensee.
- 3) All licenses would be consolidated to 3 classes after a 10 year period.

As an alternative, I would support allowing Advanced class licensees to retain their license on the premise that Advanced under old rules was more difficult to earn than Extra under current rules.

REAY

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

PAGE 1

David A. Orienti
W4BHM

1722-B Valpar Drive
Birmingham, AL. 35226
(205) 822-2114 (H) (205) 529-9820 (C)
Email - orienti@bellsouth.net
w4bhm@bellsouth.net

CODE SPEED

January 3, 2003

F.C.C.
Washington, DC

Re: Response to petition for rule making # RM-10620 from K8AD

I would like to add my opinion to the above-mentioned petition. I support this petition for the following reasons:

When I upgraded from General Class to Advanced Class back in the 70's as W8LTE, the only difference between the Advanced test and the Extra test was the 20wpm code test. Therefore, I passed the same written exam as I would have been given for upgrade to Extra Class. With the changes in code speed currently in effect, I have, in fact, passed the Extra Class license test but am only licensed as an Advanced Class operator.

Since the Advanced Class is no longer available and since I already have passed the Extra Class written test in effect at the time of my testing, I feel that I should be "upgraded" to Extra Class status.

Sincerely,

David Orienti
W4BHM
1722-B Valpar Drive
Birmingham, AL. 35226-2344

OLD { GENERAL CLASS 13 WPM
ADVANCED CLASS - 13 WPM
EXTRA - CLASS - 20 WPM

CURRENT { GENERAL - CLASS - 5 WPM
EXTRA - CLASS - 5 WPM



RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Submission

Message 4 of 22

From: Harold B Wade <halbwade@juno.com>
To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:40:03 -0500
Subject: Amateur licensing

Received: from m5.nyc.untld.com (m5.nyc.untld.com [64.136.22.68])
by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gBSEd0s29313
for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:39:01 -0500 (EST)
Received: from cookie.juno.com by cookie.juno.com for <"ljaj/63Gb00f13I0IA9nvzo9LzmTjaBCS1c069MbEHQOFNaD
Received: (from halbwade@juno.com)
by m5.nyc.untld.com (jqueuemail) id HL5GCY3E; Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:38:56 EST
To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:40:03 -0500
Subject: Amateur licensing
Message-ID: <20021228.094005.-4148557.2.halbwade@juno.com>
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.15
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=--_JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 8-6,7-8,11-12,22-23,28-29,32-33,36-37,41-46,47-32767
From: Harold B Wade <halbwade@juno.com>
X-UIDL: /U\!!^hVd9CPN!!\#*!!
Status: RO

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----_JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Dale

I saw a reference to you and your recommendation on license upgrades for advanced class in yesterdays ARRL bulletin, and have a comment to make on that.

Over fifty years ago, 1949, I was licensed as class "A", which required code proficiency at twenty words per minute, and a stiff written exam. At the same time I held a FCC commercial license for radio telegraphy, also requiring twenty words per minute. I also held FCC commercial license for radiotelephone operation. All these licenses required testing for knowledge far in excess of any of our current amateur licenses. We had to draw complete schematic diagrams for power supplies, oscillators, amplifiers etc. We had to trouble shoot equipment from diagrams supplied by the FCC. We had to receive AND send code in the presence of an FCC examiner to his satisfaction.

I was a graduate of the USAF Radio Operator school (32 weeks) which required code proficiency of twenty five words per minute for a minimum passing grade. I was also a graduate of the USAF Radio Mechanic school (36 weeks) requiring extensive knowledge of electronics hardware and circuitry.

What I am leading up to here, is that I was more than a little miffed when the FCC changed my license class to Advanced and I learned I would have to do more testing to recover my lost operating privileges.

I suppose it amounts to an attitude problem on my account, but so far I have declined to submit to any further testing in the interest of operating privileges.

Another federal agency, The FAA, recognizes military training, experience and proficiency. I am licensed as a commercial pilot by the FAA, but I have never ridden with an FAA examiner. The FAA issued the license based on my USAF rating as a pilot.

Thanks and good luck in your endeavors.

73

Hal Wade

W4NVO

-----JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; charset=3Dwindows-1252">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4522.1800" name=3DGENERATOR></HEAD>
<BODY bottomMargin=3D0 leftMargin=3D3 topMargin=3D0 rightMargin=3D3>
<DIV><STRONG>Hi Dale</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>I saw a reference to you and your recommendation on license=20
upgrades for advanced class in yesterdays ARRL bulletin, and have a comment=
to=20
make on that.</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Over fifty years ago, 1949, I was licensed&nbsp;&nbsp;as class "A", =
which=20
required&nbsp;&nbsp;code proficiency at twenty words per minute, and a stiff =
written=20
exam. At the same time I held a FCC commercial license for radio telegraphy=
,=20
also requiring twenty words per minute. I also held FCC commercial license =
for=20
radiotelephone operation. All these licenses required testing&nbsp;&nbsp;for =
knowledge=20
far in excess of&nbsp;&nbsp;any of our current amateur licenses. We&nbsp;&nbsp;had to =
draw=20
complete schematic diagrams for power supplies, oscillators, amplifiers etc=
.. We=20
had to trouble shoot equipment from diagrams supplied by the FCC. &nbsp;&nbsp;=&nbsp;
&nbsp;&nbsp;We=20
had to receive AND send code in the presence of an FCC examiner to his=20
satisfaction. </STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>I was a graduate of the USAF Radio Operator school (32 weeks) =
which=20
required code proficiency of twenty five words per minute for a minimum =
passing=20
grade. </STRONG><STRONG>I was also a graduate of the USAF Radio Mechanic =
school=20
(36 weeks) requiring extensive knowledge of electronics hardware and=20
circuitry.</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>What I am leading up to here, is that I was more than a little=
=20
miffed when the FCC changed my license class to Advanced and I learned I =
would=20
have to do more testing to recover my lost operating privileges.&nbsp;&nbsp;=20
</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>I suppose it amounts to an attitude problem on my account, but=
so=20
far I have declined to submit to any further testing in the interest of=20
operating privileges. </STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Another federal agency, The FAA, recognizes military training,=
=20
experience and proficiency. I am licensed as a commercial pilot by the FAA,=
but=20
I have never ridden with an FAA examiner. The FAA issued the license based =
on my=20
USAF rating as a pilot. </STRONG></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Thanks and good luck in your endeavors.</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>73</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Hal Wade</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>W4NVO</STRONG></DIV>

```

<DIV> </DIV></BODY></HTML>

----__JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be--

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopaedia Studios
Microcompanies With Attitude

